



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/204,238	12/03/1998	GREGORY S. HAMILTON	AR138-X	5254

7590 03/01/2002

NATH AND ASSOCIATES  
1030 FIFTEENTH STREET N W  
SIXTH FLOOR  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

CHANG, CELIA C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1625

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

31.02

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.  
**09/204,238**

Applicant(s)  
**Hamilton et al.**

Examiner  
**Celia Chang**

Art Unit  
**1625**

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 20, 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 73-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 73-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

**Attachment(s)**

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_                      20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1625

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Response filed by applicants in Paper No. 27 dated Dec.20, 2001 have been entered and considered carefully.
2. The provisional rejection of claims 73-86 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over claims 1-177 of SN 09/159,105 in view of Feghali is maintained for reason of record. Applicants argued that SN 09/159,105 encompassed a broader scope of compounds than the instant claims, thus, offered no predictability of the narrower scope of the instant claims. Please note that in absence of unexpected results, there is nothing unobvious in choosing some among many. In re Lemin 141 USPQ 814. A proper terminal disclaimer should be filed.
3. The provisional rejection of claims 73-86 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over US '187 (claim 9-12), '979 (claims 15-16 and col. 5 lines 30-32), '423 (claims 1-37) or '607 (claims 17-20) in view of SN 09/159,105 (claims 1-177) is maintained for reason of record.

An inadvertent error in reciting the claim number of the individual patents was found in the office action which is now correct (supra). The same arguments of no predictability of narrow and broad scope similar to section 2 supra was also made for this rejection. Please note that in absence of unexpected results, there is nothing unobvious in choosing some among many. In re Lemin 141 USPQ 814. A proper terminal disclaimer should be filed.
4. The rejection of claims 73-86 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph is maintained for reason of record.

Applicants argued that ordinary skilled person in the art would know what carboxylic acid and carboxylic acid isosteres are referring to. Please note that in the previous office action it

Art Unit: 1625

was explained that the first determination must be “what” is included in the scope. Is it carboxylic acid or carboxylate ? Then whether the delineation of isosteres is encompassed by the “scope” of the claims. In other words, if the claims are drawn to carboxylic acids then a carboxylate isostere does not read on the base claim. Applicants must define the Markush elements to be consistent with the Markush term definition.

4. The rejection of claims 73-86 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over ‘187 in view of King or Patani is maintained for reasons of record.

Please note that the term “bioisostere” is defined by King or Patani as being “functional” equivalence. Thus, applicants offered no rebuttal as to why a functional replacement of the carboxylate of the ‘187 with a conventional bioisosteric moiety would not function in the similar manner as the prior art. Please note that the conventional delineation of “bioisostere” being functional equivalence provided both motivation and enablement to one having ordinary skill to modify a carboxylate functionality, thus, obviousness modification. One skilled in the art would have reasonable expectation of success based on King or Patani’s teaching. Obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) does not require absolute predictability. In re Kronig 190 USPQ 425.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 1625

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Celia Chang whose telephone number is (703) 308-4702. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner can be reached by fax. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-3922.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-4702.

CCPC/Chang  
Feb. 26, 2002

  
Celia Chang  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1625